

Coverage of Electronic Serials within the CONSER Database

Background: PCC discussion of providing records for e-serials contained in packages has been going on since at least the late 1990s. The PCC Standing Committee on Automation (SCA) Task Groups on Journals in Aggregator Databases identified a desire among libraries to provide OPAC records for titles in packages as a way to manage drops and adds of titles. Early efforts of these groups focused on providing record sets for titles by machine generation in a wide range of packages. Efforts of the current task group are focused on testing a macro that can be used by a cataloger to derive a record for an e-resource in a package based on the print format record. Records derived this way for e-serials are being added to the CONSER database on a test basis rather than as part of a separate record set.

Coverage of e-resource packages within the CONSER database was presented at the Operations meeting in 2003 when guidelines for the aggregator-neutral record were agreed upon. A paper presenting informal survey questions about coverage in the CONSER database (<http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/coverage-paper.pdf>) was discussed and some general conclusions from the discussion (<http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/conop2003.html#2>) included: local OPAC records that provide e-serial access, whether through single or separate records are important to CONSER libraries for some packages; and: many libraries were using the services of serials management companies provide records for e-serials derived from the CONSER database.

At the CONSER Summit in Mar. 2004, attendees made the following recommendations:

CONSER should take a more systematic approach to coverage of electronic journals, particularly those in aggregations and journal packages. Who: CONSER Office, CONSER Operations Committee. When: Discuss at meeting in May.

And:

Analyze the CONSER database to determine current make-up. Who: CONSER Office When: 2004

Questions:

Should CONSER put together a group to systematically explore the need for more complete coverage in the CONSER database and approaches to responding to the request to increase coverage?

Currently, we have no objective data about the extent of coverage of particular packages in the database or what packages CONSER institutions subscribe to. How can this data be collected?

Several companies use the CONSER database to derive records for e-resource record services, many CONSER libraries subscribe to these services and receive record sets for controlling e-resources locally. What are the benefits or problems with this model?

Single record versus separate record approach: at the 2003 OpCo meeting, members told us most institutions make use of the single record approach. Is this still true today? What impact does this have for coverage e-package titles in the CONSER database? Is a title covered if a print record exists for it?

CONSER catalogers have informally discussed cooperatively creating records for titles in various packages, including most recently the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ). Is it possible to identify packages that are amenable to cooperatively creating records? What characteristics make a package sharable?

What should be done about aggregator packages containing both monographs and serials?

Is aggregator *package* maintenance, as opposed to individual record maintenance, a concern? Why, or why not?